

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner states that the inventions of Groups I and II are unrelated under M.P.E.P. § 806.04 and M.P.E.P. § 808.01 in that Group I is directed to oligomerization, while Group II is directed to isomerization.

However, it can be seen that the claims of Group I are directed to a process for oligomerizing isobutene in the presence of n-butene over a solid acid ion exchanger. The claims of Group II are directed to a process for preparing 1-butene from a C<sub>4</sub>-hydrocarbon mixture by converting (oligomerizing) the C<sub>4</sub>-hydrocarbon mixture over a solid acid ion exchanger into a product mixture and removing from the product mixture 1-butene by distillation. Therefore, it can be seen that both Groups I and II contain the same reaction step: reacting a C<sub>4</sub>-hydrocarbon mixture over an acidic, solid ion exchanger. Thus, it is clear that the inventions of Groups I and II are related, since both contain an oligomerization step. Therefore, the requirements for Restriction of M.P.E.P. § 806.04 and M.P.E.P. § 808.01 have not been met and it is requested that the claims of Groups I and II be rejoined and examined in the present application.

Further, Applicants traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that thousands of U.S. patents have issued in which many more than two sub-classes have been searched and the Patent and Trademark Office can not reasonably assert that a burden exists in searching only two sub-classes.

Accordingly, for the reasons presented above, it is submitted that the Patent and Trademark Office has failed to meet the burden necessary to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon



Roland E. Martin  
Registration No. 48,082

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)